

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

MEADVILLE THEOLOGICAL
SCHOOL LIBRARY

UNITY

CONTENTS

Editorial Comments	3
The Origin of Good and Evil.....	5
<i>Oscar Riddle</i>	
A Challenge to Adult Educators.....	12
<i>James E. Amick</i>	
Science and Religion As Evolutionary Forces	15
<i>Leo F. Koch</i>	
The Dilemma of Today's Religious Liberal	19
<i>John W. Brigham</i>	
Bookman's Notebook	25
Western Unitarian Conference.....	30

MARCH-APRIL, 1959

VOL. CXLV, No. 1

PRICE FIFTY CENTS

U N I T Y

Established 1878

RANDALL S. HILTON, *Editor*

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

JAMES E. AMICK—"A Challenge to Adult Educators"—is an independent life insurance broker, a former teacher, a member of the Boards of Directors of the Missouri Adult Education Association and the All Souls Unitarian Church of Kansas City, Missouri.

JOHN W. BRIGHAM—"The Dilemma of Today's Religious Liberal"—is Minister of the Unitarian Fellowship of Burlington, Iowa, and Associate Director Designate for the Department of Ministry of the American Unitarian Association.

LEO F. KOCH—"Science and Religion As Evolutionary Forces"—is a Professor of Biology at the University of Illinois, and a member of the Board of Directors of the American Humanist Association.

OSCAR RIDDLE—"The Origin of Good and Evil"—is a retired Professor of Biology, author, editor, and lecturer, and an outstanding American humanist.

Published bimonthly except during July and August
by the

Abraham Lincoln Centre
700 Oakwood Boulevard
Chicago 53, Illinois

Subscription \$2.

Single Copies 50 cents.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter October 7, 1952, at the postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

Editorial Comments

THE Overstreets, Harry and Bonaro, have done it again. The clear and lucid style which has graced all their writings has now been utilized to help the American people understand Communism. *What We Must Know About Communism* is a presentation of just that. Armed with such knowledge it should be possible to remain calm and stand firm on the principles of freedom and the democratic process. Short of revolution itself, nothing so pleases the devotees of the dialectics of "the end justifies the means" as to have otherwise solid citizens yield to hysteria, mutual suspicion, and name calling. The "keep them off balance" tactics can be successful only when people are not sure of their footing because they have not taken the trouble to learn the facts and to thus know the ground on which they stand. If our leaders read the Overstreets and use the knowledge correctly, it can contribute much to our domestic tranquillity and to our world leadership.

The drive towards Merger between the Unitarians and Universalists moves on apace with the support and blessings of the administrations of both denomina-

tions. However, from where we sit it looks very much like both administrations are ambivalent, inconsistent, or downright hypocritical.

The Universalists, after reducing their contribution some 35 per cent to the one genuine cooperative and merged effort, the Division of Education of the Council of Liberal Churches, froze their budget. Later when it was unfrozen, it was not to help the Council of Liberal Churches but rather to set up a new Extension Department.

The Unitarians, while greatly increasing their contributions to the Council, are now engaged in a \$3,000,000 drive for a "Unitarian" Development Fund.

This administrative schizophrenia is anything but assuring. Those who are in love with Merger seem blind to the potential marital difficulties. Those who are opposed to Merger might welcome the new Extension Department or the Development Fund if it were not so clear that the combined power of administration support and the Brotherhood sentiment was catapulting the churches toward Merger. The starry-eyed idealists are creating quite a mess which will take the practical tac-

ticians some ten to twenty years to straighten out.

Regardless of the trials and tribulations of the day, we find the Jack Paar show a pleasant and relaxing way to conclude it. In Chicago, we are fortunate enough to have it for the full hour and forty-five minutes. It covers the range of interests from humor to pathos; sometimes intentionally and sometimes unintentionally. Being a sensitive or maybe sentimental person ourself, we are glad that he does not hold back his tears when he is deeply touched. When he is moved to comment on some issue, he does so with a simple eloquence that is genuinely meaningful. His recent soliloquy on intolerance was stirring and to the point. We congratulate him also on the network publicity he gave to the acquittal of Dave Gardner. Besides being a good deed on behalf of Mr. Gardner, it was an indirect but deserved rebuke to the press which is so quick to publish charges of wrongdoing but so seldom rectifies them when they are proven false. Perhaps to prove Jack Paar's point that everybody has some intolerance, we could not help but wonder in the Gardner case if the police would have entered Gard-

ner's room in Atlanta if his visitors had not been Negro?

While we are on the subject of television, we were fascinated with the press reports of the address given by Mr. David Sarnoff of the National Broadcasting Company to the National Association of Broadcasters. He made it very clear that the duty of a mass communications media was to cater to the masses. His term was the "majority." Nowhere was it reported that Mr. Sarnoff recognized the fact that mass tastes are largely influenced by the fare dished out to the masses from the cradle up by mass media. We are inclined to agree with the critics, on whom Mr. Sarnoff has declared war, that the Broadcasters have a responsibility to improve the aesthetic, cultural, and intellectual tastes of the people. Recent programming has gone into reverse gear, and if the Broadcasters follow Mr. Sarnoff's advice we can only look forward to a continuing series of new lows in the broadcasting market. It is to be hoped that the critics, the public, and the sponsors unite to put some backbone and courage into the Broadcasters so that they will support competent excellence instead of competence in mediocrity.

(Continued on page 24)

The Origin of Good and Evil

OSCAR RIDDLE

WHATEVER they may be said to be, good and evil have their home in living organisms. More definitely, their home is almost limited to fellow creatures of our own species—to individuals, each of whom Shafer has called “a fearful compound of grandeur and misery.” And, paradox or not, these moral twins have no existence apart from their self-building home. Too, this home—the marvelous body of man—is the most evolved and intricate of living units in the known universe. But bodies of animals were forefathers of those of man, and a series of simpler animals sprouted roots for morality long before the blossom—good and evil—could arise. It thus becomes clear that a biologist may examine these twins in the cradle where they were born. This task would seem easier if that cradle were a thing firmly fixed in space and time. Actually, however, we deal with a cradle that is slowly self-building, fluid, repetitive, conditional—all for the very good reason that it is *living organism*.

An organism—any organism—can be neither swiftly dissected nor easily grasped in thought. A century of astonishingly successful biological experience has provided

us with several concepts relating to organism which are not yet a part of popular thought. The thing we call an organism must be regarded as a self-building, self-united whole. It is not a machine. It definitely is an integrated entity whose integrity, at every instant, is dependent upon pervasive showers of regulated release and transfer of energy, and of free-flowing adjustments, all made at both molecular and bodily levels. The continuing total or sum of such transfers and adjustments provides the phenomenon we call life; and organism itself does not exist apart from the living process. The organism called man is a relatively new item—a species floating at the flowering end of a long line of natural processes which have attended all moments of the epoch of life on earth.

In looking for the origin of good and evil, the search properly extends to whatever is known to exist or to have probable existence. Within that universe, since the Darwin of 1859, the natural sciences find that the something which is truly “universal” is *process*; and this, says philosopher John Dewey, “is the most revolutionary discovery yet made.” Two aspects of the operation of that

process, aspects here called principles, should now be mentioned although the single principle—that of transformism, or change with time—includes the whole of that process. A brief reference to the two principles will assist the closer view of change which rational thought requires.

The doors to the ever-emerging new are opened by the operation of the principles of chemical combination and of integrative levels. Every chemical union between two atoms or molecules yields a molecule with properties not present in either of the two units that entered into it. New properties thus emerge. This endless, inevitable, and self-propelling procedure, continued through all time, seems to have provided us with all of the complex molecules or compounds now found in the non-living universe and in the living world; and also—subject to what is said below on integrative levels—with all the new properties attached to these compounds. It is entirely probable that some such compounds and properties, new to our earth, are still arising for the first time within the living world.

The factors concerned in changes in species have been found to include not only the natural selection of Darwin but also mutation and recombination. Heritable changes are thus covered by this law of modification with de-

scend. In fact, it is to a series of special molecules called genes—proved bearers of heredity—that we now confidently look for rewarding insight into the intimate processes that build the organism, which both initiate and usually conserve changes in organism, and which constitute the thread of life on which the organism endures from epoch to epoch. Other principles or laws relate to more restricted processes of the single organism—such as digestive and psychic activities; reference to such laws can be omitted here. At this point, however, it may be added that the principle of chemical combination is already known to have yielded, within the inorganic world, differing molecules by the thousands; while in the protein-infested living world such molecules have spawned in terms of millions. Also, one notes that the word emergence, as used here, refers simply to the new properties which arise necessarily from new chemical associations; it has no anti-mechanistic meaning.

Within the scale of increasing complexity of the natural world, i.e., along the path taken by all evolutionary process, the competent student meets—or seems to meet—a very few “wholes” which exhibit new and notably unpredictable properties. Such states, stages, or “wholes” are called integrative levels. One such is the

highly complex molecular state that attained the property of self-duplication and growth (liveness; organism). This superior type of aggregate became subject to biological laws—to which no simpler grouping is subject—and through the ages at least some of these superior aggregates (organisms) have proved their capacity to yield further new and unpredictable dimensions and properties. Another such level—and topmost in the entire evolutionary process—is society. This supraorganism is clearly man's own creation. But only relatively recent men, men already equipped with such rare emergents as language and abstract thought, could begin to give it form, power, and promise. The laws and properties of society are, again, unpredictable and wholly unlike those of the individual men that compose it. Largely anticipating the conclusion to which this sketch leads, one may here remark that it is only in this fluid man-made realm, society, that morals—good and evil—acquire their essential stature and meaning. If man had proved himself a type of "lone-wolf," there would now exist on earth no such things as language, society, good and evil.

Just one short detour remains of this excursion into the sub-microscopic and the technically obscure. Incidentally, the detour will make clear a further reason

for doing an excursion into the small and the strange. The existence, in fair quantity, of numerous inorganic molecules—each with special and differing properties—was doubtless essential to the origin of life in the waters of a younger earth. But early, if not earliest, fragments of "life" also certainly must have met other fragments (either living or non-living molecules) which were adverse or destructive to them whenever or wherever such incompatible molecules were encountered in effective concentration. Do we at this point—the point at which "life" is destroyed by adventitious agents—meet the emergents we seek? Do we here first meet good and evil? We shall see that the answer is "No." And we hasten to note that the reason for this negative does not rest on the extra circumstance that—knowing what we now know—these and similar assaults on early living things actually also must have assisted the origin of numerous new types of life (including scavengers) and, in fact, guaranteed a many-branched "tree of life." The real reason is that no activity involving "the alternative of choice" is present here. The home of good and evil must be sought in much higher organisms in which such choice is possible. The cradle we seek is not to be found in the

broad inorganic universe, nor in the entire present expanse of the plant world, nor yet in simpler animal life, but in animals much nearer at hand—in our more immediate and cerebrum-equipped ancestors.

One next examines the nature of morals for aid it can provide for fixing the more precise stage in animal ascent when good and evil appear among the multitude of evolutionary emergents. Related facts may thereafter lead us to the roots or precursors of those emerging qualities.

One must join John Dewey (*Human Nature and Conduct*, 1922) in saying that "morals has to do with all activity into which alternative possibilities enter. For wherever they enter a difference between better and worse arises. . . . The better is the good. . . . The worse or evil is a rejected good; until it is rejected it is a competing good." Here is essential aid to perspective, to clear definition, and to inclusion of all the available facts. Incidentally, it should not be surprising if, in the always growing complexity of man's social life, some things now and again rejected (as evil) in both individual and group "choice," are ultimately accepted (as good) by that or another group. Hence a need for ever-increasing comprehension, for endless discussion, and for fresh ex-

amination of the presumed good and the presumed evil. On this broad playground of human choice one may suspect that, to date, biological man has made more hits than errors, though social man is still merely striving to learn the rules of the game.

Since good and evil emerge only when an alternative activity is elected, it follows—through definition—that the home of these twins is limited to those higher animals which meet this condition. "Morals is at home wherever considerations of the worse and the better are involved," says Dewey. It is, then, wholly clear that *Homo sapiens* is foremost in this field; and we here omit discussion of such minor details as which of his own ancestors, including earlier species of *Homo*, and which if any of his competitors among higher animals, share morality with him. It is notable, however, that morals—good and evil—do not automatically attach to all stages and conditions of a human being. The period of infancy of all of us, and the insanity of some of us, are excluded; they are *unmoral*. No consideration of better and worse is involved.

On the other hand, the precursors or roots of morality are found in abundance in quite dissimilar higher but sub-human species. Those roots are several

loosely related things, and even a slight search among them discloses something very like a conscience in many dogs. Likewise, bear cubs and the young of baboons are disciplined by their parents; and here the habits thus early formed and enforced in the offspring, lead to one *parent-desired* alternative activity instead of another.

Among the innate roots of morals and of conscience in higher animals are sociality, sympathy, parental love. The trait of sociality is especially meaningful, since in some species of monkeys and apes it led to the "family" group. Scholars quite generally agree that the family has been the foremost institution in the development of man's basic morality. In regard to early Nile Valley man, Breasted (*The Dawn of Conscience*, 1933) says:

As we look back into human beginnings we discover at once that man began as an *unmoral* savage. . . . It is safe to conclude that, like modern natives still surviving in a primitive stage of life, the earliest Egyptians had only unmoral local gods, and a body of customs which had not yet become morals. In their own deepening experience and broadening vision we must find the magic which transformed these primitive hunters and their little settlements of

wattle huts into a great society. . . . Furthermore the earliest morals were only folk custom which might have nothing to do with the gods or with religion. . . . The moral impulses in the life of man have grown up out of the influences that operate in family relationships. . . . As historical fact, it is to family life that we owe the greatest debt which the mind of man can conceive.

The word "conscience" — neglected to this point—crept into a statement made above. It is distinct from good and evil, and a difference should not remain unnoted. One takes no long excursion along the ladder of living things to learn the nature and the home of conscience. One does need to look mainly to man, and there focus sharply on one usually overlooked contingency in the life of a human being. The whole matter is well summarized in this single sentence of T. H. Green:

No man makes a conscience for himself; he needs society to make it for him." A human being reared in isolation, wholly apart from all humankind, would have no conscience. This valued human asset is among the magnificent evolutionary emergents at the family and social level—a product of suitable human association.

Quite evident now is the fact—recently very clearly restated by

Weston La Barre (*The Human Animal*, 1954)—that human society is just as firmly rooted in biology as is ant society; that the very possibility of "family life" arose when our primate ancestors added a non-seasonal sexuality to the ancient mammalian concern of a mother for her young—in other words, when a female could be interested in a husband and children at the same time. Only in a permanent group like this could children be taken care of through a longer infancy; only where all this was true was it possible for *language* to be developed. With language came the possibility for abstract thought and for truly human society. Further, since only society can build a conscience for the individual, society shares heavily with all the more basic biology in the building of human morality. Again, though our cultural satisfactions are numerous indeed, anthropologist La Barre thinks that they are deeply founded in "pleasure in other people's bodies," and, moreover, that the only two "unqualifiedly good things in human life are connubial and parental love."

The purely natural and inevitable characteristics of good and evil are well illustrated by some qualities which are merely the extremes of one and the same thing. They are good when present in small or moderate amount; evil

when present in excess. They are qualitatively the same, and only quantitatively do they differ. Anxiety is such a trait or quality. Anthropologist Margaret Mead (*New York Times Magazine*, May 20, 1956) has well described these two aspects of anxiety. It is civilized man that is anxious; the untaught savage is frightened or terrorized. "It is clear that we have developed a society which depends on having the *right* amount of anxiety to make it work." It is good to have enough anxiety to wish to get well when sick; to see a doctor about a symptom which may indicate cancer; to check up on the old life insurance policy; and to refuse an auto ride with a near-blind or irresponsible driver. But it is evil to have the excess of anxiety that breaks one's own mental health, or that, through vocalization or other expression of such anxiety, disturbs all family life.

With the preceding lines we end this chore of sketching present insights into the nature and biological-social origin of good and evil—indeed, of insights into the supreme and wholly natural powers and responsibilities of one's own self. But we can now avoid facing one vitally related query only by flouting candor and by mocking the need to use facts for constructive thought and moral act. Is this New Revelation an

effective possession, or likely to become a possession, of any people or society of our time? For all peoples outside the Iron Curtain the answer is clearly "No." And, to this writer, the extremely menacing implications of the answer center in the circumstance that an arresting array of scientific studies have provided a light which mankind of today is unprepared to accept and use. The reason for the negative answer is of course readily understood: This light forcefully tends to dissipate supernaturalism, meanwhile putting naturalism boldly into the foreground; and, now as always, there are both persons and powerful institutions ready to resist any revised view of self. The supporters of supernaturalism—the organized religions—effectively exclude this light from almost all of the school-rooms of the free world. The facts and frame of thought briefly sketched above can be taught in the primary and secondary schools of no Christian land. Further, in only a minority of their colleges does a thin minority of students get even sketchy instruction in the facts and areas we have presumed to survey in these pages. Equally revealing, and head on, we here meet the biting irony involved in man's over-prolonged attempt to fuse the area of ethics with that of religion.

From this it also follows that

scholarship in general has inadequately met much that is meaningful, yes, perhaps essential, for the survival of modern society. How, then, may we expect our lawgivers, administrators, business men, teachers, ministers, and writers to have met and digested these far-flung disclosures—many of them only recently wrenched, in hard-earned fragments, from the deep silences within the widely stretched inorganic and living worlds? Why expect adequate penetrance of this tabooed knowledge into even the highest scholarship of art, literature, or history when it is quite clear and certain that numerous scientists—more especially those trained in the physical sciences—remain unaware of some vital segments of the evidence that establishes it? More than a few of our foremost scientists do not accept the *natural* origin of the *good*—i. e., of morals—and they may give this as a basis for their belief in a "universe of the spirit," and, so, in a form of religion. Nearly five years ago chemist Conant, former president of Harvard, thus expressed this view with unusual clarity:

As to the unifying materialistic World Hypothesis, my doubt stems from its manifest inadequacy. As a conceptual scheme attempting to account for everything in the whole universe, it seems to me unsatis-

factory because it is incomplete. It fails to provide for the altruistic and idealistic side of human nature. . . . for the unselfish ways in which human beings often act with compassion, love, friendliness, self-sacrifice, the desire to mitigate human suffering. In short, it is the problem of "good," not evil, that requires some other formulation of human personality than that provided by the usual naturalistic moralist.

We ask: When we consider the belated, slight, and occasional college instruction offered on these scattered elements of learning, may we expect more than a fraction of physical scientists—a group compelled to go also deeply into mathematics—to have mastered what our Darwins, Frazers, Deweys, Freuds, Breasteds, and their legion of successors have done to

uncover the sources of morality? Contradicting Dr. Conant, our most competent investigators of the areas involved are convinced that "good" and evil came to us as a pair—and in the way lightly sketched above. To them, naturalism most definitely does not "fail to provide for the altruistic and idealistic side of human nature." This region of crucial fact is known—and it is usually wholly convincing—to competent students of *animal* biology and of genetic psychology; but it is unknown or unfamiliar ground to most botanists and physical scientists. This untaught but incisive attainment of animal biology—and also this prime source of uncritical "religious" thought in many scientists—are treated more adequately in my recent book (*The Unleashing of Evolutionary Thought*. Vantage Press, 1954).

A Challenge to Adult Educators*

JAMES E. AMICK

WHY don't adult educators eschew the peepholes to personality and concentrate on pushing open the massive doors which are blocking the sun-

light of inquiry from the house of human development? Why don't they push first on the door to the living room—a room named "Curiosity"? Native childhood curiosity—the child's frank open questioning—gets battered, buffeted,

*Delivered to the Annual Conference of The Missouri Valley Adult Education Association, Omaha, Nebraska, March 21, 1958.

squelched, and repressed from early childhood. The habit subsides. Questions are answered, if at all, with much untruth, evasion, half truth, and myth. The appetite wanes. Generalities, platitudes, prejudices, and hates abound. They wither the childhood blossom of inquiry. So society gives to you, adults who are "dull, over-aged adolescents . . . domesticated, two-legged cattle, capable of nothing but ignorant brutality toward each other . . . who cannot afford the expense of the human adventure," as Frank Jennings says. First, you must revive the habit of curiosity and nurture the shriveled spirit of inquiry.

Another door in this house of human development is labeled "Political." How does one, in 1958, achieve a working relationship between the individual and his fellow citizens which is happy, effective, and dynamic; and is applicable at the local level, the regional, the national, and the world level? Can man find the answer in the future which has eluded him to date? Must groups of men choose between "Big Brother" on the one hand and the buffeting of the fates and circumstances on the other? Will madness between groups erase 2,500 million persons, and all other life, from earth? Do men care enough about the fate of man to take constructive action in directing his fate?

Also, why don't they develop the Socio-economic room? Men fairly cry for a society instead of a lonely crowd; for a society, as such, rather than hundreds of fragmented societies. Man wants democracy in the economic realm. He wants a chance to achieve, and he needs a sense of value. He has much pioneering before he has correlated his human needs and his required goods and services with the vast potentials of automation, whose secret is known, and the astronomic energy of controlled fusion, whose secret may soon be revealed.

And why don't they enlighten the darkest room of all; the one labeled "Religious"? The sunlight of reason and the scientific method are largely still excluded by myths and superstitions which were logically obsolete in the Athens of twenty-five centuries ago. If you doubt that reason is excluded, check it. For example, see how many adults know three recent books in this area: two by eminent philosophers, Lamont and Russell, and one by a world-famed biologist, Huxley. A thousand to one they won't be known to most adults, and one hundred to one they are not at your favorite bookstore. (*Religion without Revelation*, by Julian Huxley: Harper Bros. *Philosophy of Humanism*, by Corliss Lamont: Philosophical Library. *Why I Am Not a Chris-*

tion, by Bertrand Russell: Simon & Schuster.) But look closely and you will see a thousand shadows from a hundred orthodoxies darkening the fragile lamp of the human spirit; beckoning a backward look to the dead days of yore instead of to the vistas of man's future. Of course we must know and learn from the great minds of the past; but the very measure of their greatness is the extent of their break with their past—their vistas of man's future. As Albert Schweitzer has said: "In my view no other destiny awaits mankind than that which, through its mental and spiritual disposition, it prepares for itself."

These "rooms" but suggest a few specific areas. In short, why don't adult educators, in 1958, at the beginning of the exploration of outer space, start a profound exploration of inner space in those vast areas of the mind and spirit which are peculiarly and significantly human? Birds can weave baskets, beavers can carve wood, prairie dogs can model clay; and I'm glad men do these things, too. I'm happy for wholesome hobbies, for beautiful arts, for our gadgets, and for our exploding advances in the physical sciences. But comparatively speaking, our social sciences may now well be in their pre-Galileo period of development. And our present psychology

may be comparable to the status of medicine before the discovery of bacteria. While the physical sciences move into the fourth state of matter, the plasmic, most common but unknown until recently, the human problems are still mostly attended by those curious midwives — alchemy, divination, and magic.

Yet the real business of man is man and what he wills to do about the fate of his today and his tomorrows within those areas of choice wherein nature has left him free to maneuver. Can he ever approach his maximum potential contribution to himself and his society? Can he envisage and approach and perfect, and continuously reperfect, a dynamic peace and a fruitful human brotherhood? Can he thrust aside a score of presumed historic determinisms and exercise his supreme opportunity to create a world of love and plenty? Or will the button of his own destruction be pushed because he didn't care enough to make the choices which would have staid the hand that pushed it? Why don't adult educators raise the questions regarding *those* choices? For time was when men could choose to be, or not to be, better men. Now is the time to choose to be better men, or not to be.

Science and Religion As Evolutionary Forces

LEO F. KOCH

TWO of the most influential forces shaping the evolutionary patterns of civilization are generated by scientific inquiry and religious faith. A tragic aspect of contemporary civilization is that these forces, for the most part, operate independently and very often at cross-purposes. Thus social stagnation results when science and religion are channeled into separate whirlpools apart from the mainstream of human, social existence. Within those whirlpools, their potential benefits for mankind are largely wasted in fruitless frustration.

Heredity, both biological and social, is not an unalloyed blessing. Defects and weaknesses are transmitted as regularly from generation to generation as are strength and capacity for intelligence. Our cultural heritage contains both sublime wisdom and sublime nonsense; treasures of knowledge and know-how as well as millstones of myth and tradition. The intellectual iron curtain which threatens to divide and destroy Western culture emanates, not from Moscow, but from the fossilized abstractions to which our culture clings.

Dogma and orthodoxy were relatively innocuous before tech-

nological advances transformed the laissez-faire societies of the nineteenth century into the atomic-energy-fused beehives of today. But now, new cultural forms are needed to harness the power of the atom, and the shackles of dogmatism are inadequate to protect us from the dangers of radioactivity and the blessings of fecundity.

Despite the popular misconceptions of scientists and clergy as supermen in their respective spheres, these notables have failed miserably in teaching laymen even the most elementary truths which their respective disciplines hold to be self-evident. In the past, scientists dissociated themselves from their communities by selling their democratic birthright for a mess of ivory-tower pottage.

Thus, John Dewey's insight that objectivity, tentativeness, and open-mindedness, such as prevail in the natural sciences, should be extended to the social sciences and the humanities has not been acted upon.

If I am not too naive, ethics and morals are, or should be, one of the primary concerns of religious institutions. As Mayer and Brower stated: "Genuine morality stresses

relatedness, not smugness. Genuine morality is concerned with man's inhumanity to man, not trivial social conventions. Genuine morality is not shocked by life, but looks upon it as an invitation to transvaluation." (*Patterns of a New Philosophy*, p. 107.) From this perspective, the majority of religious institutions of Western civilization, if not of the world, stand self-convicted of treason to their spiritual heritage. Contemporary human beings have become so accustomed to seeking religion in an institution that they have forgotten that the essence of it is part of human nature. They are confused by what Dewey called the "difference between religion, a religion, and the religious; between anything that may be denoted by a noun substantive and the quality of experience that is designated by an adjective." (*A Common Faith*, p. 3.)

The same misconception has prevailed among us about science, a science, and the scientific experience. Small wonder that the inspiration which the few have drawn from science and religion is not contagious and that the masses are not stirred from their lethargy by them.

Another important obstacle in the path of social reform is the universal distrust which has arisen among the diverse whirlpools within society. Locally, school

teachers dare not introduce their students to the biological or social facts of life for fear of dismissal; professors must swear allegiance to their nation as if they were foreign immigrants; scientists are sworn to secrecy as if they were common gossips; ministers who dare to have an original thought are excommunicated; many business men and politicians must keep all of their transactions private because they are inevitably suspect. Above all, there is no correlation between the codes of morality which are extolled publicly and those which are practiced privately.

Never before has there been such a chasm between fact and potentiality. In spite of the ever-greater abundance of food and resources which could be manufactured, a large proportion of humanity remains ill-fed, ill-clad, and ill-housed. In spite of common aspirations to peace and brotherhood, nations are burdened with vast commitments to preparation for war and wholesale destruction. In spite of our vast cultural heritage, the social planning which could use these assets constructively is lacking.

"The demand that churches show a more active interest in social affairs, that they take a definite stand upon such questions as war, economic justice, political corruption, that they stimulate

action for a divine kingdom on earth, is one of the signs of the times." (Dewey, *ibid.*, p. 83.) One might paraphrase this sentence and apply it equally well to scientists.

Among nations, force is still sovereign. And force will remain sovereign until reason and faith shall learn to cooperate in its mastery. As Dewey wrote: "Men have never fully used the powers they possess to advance the good in life, because they have waited upon some power external to themselves and to nature to do the work they are responsible for doing." (*Ibid.*, p. 46.)

The A-bomb at Hiroshima shattered more than the lives and homes of thousands of innocent human beings; it also shattered the myth of the ivory-tower. But in typical fashion, scientists of all nations are busily engaged in reconstructing more lasting foundations for their social structures. By virtue of their training and discipline, scientists are remarkably cooperative. Their unparalleled humility, industry, and dedication to the common welfare ought to be recognized and rewarded more liberally than in the past.

Although many clergymen are similarly motivated, most of them pledge their allegiance first to their vested interests rather than to the community. The so-called revival of religion since

World War II is not as indicative of progress toward utopia as many would claim. Fear and anxiety about successive international crises probably stimulated more attendance at churches than did conviction and dedication.

As yet, the liberal religious movement, represented by the Universalist and Unitarian churches, the American Ethical Union, and the American Humanist Association, is suspect among a majority of the nation's citizens. Religious liberalism is near a stalemate because of antagonism from its more conservative brethren and the general apathy and indifference of scholars and scientists. One is reminded of the old saying that all wise men have the same religion but wise men never tell.

But now having totalled the credit side of the ledger, perhaps we should turn to an inventory of assets. Among them is the unprecedented quantity of material goods which comes from modern technology in agriculture and industry. The success of UNESCO as an international agency is ample evidence of the universal appeal to man of the benefits of scientific advance. With the mitigation of the intensity of physical drives, motives of greed and power may yet be superseded by humanitarian and humane ideals.

Miracles, it seems, are no longer limited to the realm of the super-

natural. Scientific research has yielded magical powers in medicine and technology. But to glean the full benefits of these natural miracles, many good people must outgrow their guilt feelings about pleasure and happiness on earth. The liberation of the masses of people from fear of the supernatural, so that they can mature emotionally and assume the sense of responsibility which is necessary in a democratic society, is a task for a faith in man that moves mountains.

Barring some cosmic disaster, the human organism has proved to be an effective agent in its ecosystem. When viewed from the perspective of organic evolution, the human species has achieved a control of its environment as well as of itself which is unique in the entire history of life on earth.

Once the limitless potentiality of human purpose guided by scientific knowledge is realized, man will assume the responsibility for directing his future development. Even our present inadequate knowledge of genetics and evolution clearly establishes this as a reasonable hypothesis.

Another insight for which we are indebted to biologists is that organic evolution, and social evolution too, need not necessarily improve man's lot automatically. A general principle is that the future belongs to those

organisms whose living and death influence their ecosystem in such a manner that livable conditions are maintained for their progeny.

But human purpose can provide direction, and scientific knowledge can provide control. In the words of John Dewey (*ibid.*, p. 87):

The ideal ends to which we attach our faith are not shadowy and wavering. They assume concrete form in our understanding of relations to one another and the values contained in these relations. We who now live are parts of a humanity that extends into the remote past, a humanity that has interacted with nature. The things in civilization we most prize are not of ourselves. They exist by grace of the doings and sufferings of the continuous human community in which we are a link. Ours is the responsibility of conserving, transmitting, rectifying and expanding the heritage of values we have received that those who come after us may receive it more solid and secure, more widely accessible and more generously shared than we received it. Here are all the elements for a religious faith that shall not be confined to sect, class, or race. Such a faith has always been implicitly the common faith of all mankind. It remains to make it explicit and militant.

The Dilemma of Today's Religious Liberal

JOHN W. BRIGHAM

BY AND large today's religious liberal is aware that religion is greater than Christianity; that religion is a universal and inclusive term and that Christianity is a subheading. Now this recognition by itself marks a difference of attitude and understanding when we are confronted by the widely and loudly asserted claim that "it's being a Christian that matters." For there are those, and they are many, who will insist with every fiber of their being and every vocal cord in their throats that the failure to be a Christian is the same as being irreligious. The religious liberal, therefore, wherever he may be, is faced by this charge, and is forced to confront the dilemma. We cannot escape it, but we must attempt to understand it and finally resolve it.

Among the orthodox Christians there has long been a certainty as to what a Christian is: He is a born-again individual. He has passed through a religious experience and emerged on the nether side, converted to the faith. Now it may be that once is enough or it may be, as our evangelist, Billy Graham, has recently said, that being converted is like taking a

bath — you need the experience regularly. In brief, once is not necessarily enough, but repeated Saturday night conversions or Sunday conversions are required to hold the effect.

This, it seems to me, is slightly beside the point or our concern, which is the realization that for many there is no other way of becoming a Christian and likewise no other way of becoming a religious person than through this conversion process. It is as necessary in the matter as the fermentation of juices is for the making of alcoholic beverages. One does not take place without the other.

Under this test, very few of us would qualify as Christians, I suspect, assuming for the moment that we accept this very rigid and tight definition. Yet we do not consider ourselves to be irreligious as a consequence, and we are even inclined to doubt that the absence of conversion in our instance automatically writes us off the Christian ledger.

The religious liberal then turns to himself and to his compatriots to see what identifying marks there may be that distinguish his faith as religious, and to determine, as well as he may, the rela-

tionship of these to what might truly be called Christian.

He finds certain common identifying marks. Dr. A. Powell Davies gave thought to this in one of his printed addresses while minister of our Washington churches. Said Dr. Davies: "People are Unitarians [and for this I would substitute the term *religious liberals*] because of things that happen to them, not because a religious doctrine appeals to their minds. It amounts to an active, honest participation in a community of persons who intend to improve their environment." This quotation, interesting as it is, does not, however, reach to the heart of the matter. It speaks rather of the active consequence of a deeper conviction or set of convictions. And this set of deeper convictions focuses on man's belief about man as he exists, a living being, in a universe of life.

We discover that we have a confidence in both man, the living being, and in the universe where his life is set. This confidence persuades us that we can repose trust in ourselves, in our reason, in our conscience, in our nature, in our powers of observation and deduction, in our insights. We are convinced that this is the ground of all other confidences great or small that we may have; that out of this basic confidence, religion itself takes root for growth.

Yet behind this confidence of self, there lie even deeper realms of conjecture, thought, and conclusion, tentative though they must be. This relates to the knowledge and—more than knowledge—the empathic response that we have for the total setting of our existence. This is the depth from which may come the universal concepts such as Schweitzer's "reverence of life," or Huxley's "sacredness of all existence." It is from this feeling and response for the universe itself that we draw our confidence for the particular life that is so peculiarly our own, and for the multitude of particular lives that swirl around our own in the day-after-day sequences of social living.

These are matters that do not rest on scripture, even though the sense of which we have been speaking is certainly present and finds expression in the noblest and finest expressions of all of the world's scriptures—Judaic, Christian, Moslem, Buddhist, and others—to say nothing of the continuing expression in the poetry, hymnody, and great documents of human freedom. These matters rest squarely upon the response of men, individually and together, to the reality of life, and it is this which gives them their authority upon our minds, our attitudes, our lives.

In the resolution of the dilemma of today's religious liberal, it seems

to me, and I would try to persuade you to the same opinion, that this source of faith is the surest and most dependable. It may be relied upon with surer confidence than can any of the sources that have been proposed or made authoritative by the councils of the Church in Christian history. It is a surer source than the creeds, the Popes, the books, for all of these are surely secondary, even tertiary, to the primary source available to men and women in every condition of life in all cultures on all continents. There is, for the religious, a connection between religious affirmation and the objective order of reality.

There is a connection between the information reaching us from the astrophysicists, such as Harlow Shapley has given us recently in his book, *Of Stars and Men*, and the information now known and made available from the many physical and social sciences. Religious affirmations to be honestly complete require some harmony with the objective world of reality as well as with the subjective desires that develop and exist within us.

It is in this area between these two that a simply tremendous part of the religious life and thought of the population today breaks down, and fails to achieve the harmony. Thus we discover the

extensive practice of compartmentalizing religion away from objective reality; a cozy practice but one which tends to place religion in the rather strange position of never really influencing the real life of the person in a truly significant manner. There are those within our liberal churches who are caught in this conflict, for it would be simply an enormous error to conclude that because a church is generally liberal all who belong to it have achieved the point where their religious affirmations exhibit a real harmony with objective reality.

The resolution of the dilemma of today's religious liberal will, I believe, come as we arrive at the point where we can stand in rather complete agreement with Sir Julian Huxley in the position he develops in the new edition of *Religion Without Revelation*. This position may be summed up in his own words as follows:

I feel that the religion of the future must have as its basis the consciousness of sanctity in existence—in common things, in the events of human life, in the gradually comprehended interlocking whole revealed to the human desire for knowledge; in the benedictions of beauty and love; in the catharsis, the sacred purging, of the moral drama in which the character is pitted against fate, and even

deepest tragedy may uplift the mind.

Let us take from this quotation what is the key phrase: "the consciousness of sanctity in existence." It is impossible to overemphasize the paramount importance of this or a similar concept as the basis for a liberal religious faith, and as the basis for a developing religious life. In it is found the seed of a universal religious faith, for it opens the mind and the heart to the search after a comprehension of all things. Within the individual it becomes a commanding, driving force toward a consideration of connection with all other things, for the cause of his own being, and all the relationships which his life has to all other things and beings.

We may begin with a moment where each of us, single selves, has gathered in a pleasant and a common room to unite in voice and mind. We may range in thought to concepts of the far-flung landscapes that lie to every quarter of the compass; we may think together of the wonderful favor of a life in a land of freedom; we may share with each other the griefs and sorrows of our fellowmen in Hungary, South Africa, or the Soviet lands; our minds may soar in contemplation of the infinite wonders and majesties of the heavens that stretch toward limitless horizons; and in

the totality of this existence, in this completeness of life, we may then discover and know the objects of worship that are worthy of the true religion of man.

There is nothing in this that is peculiarly Christian, nor peculiarly of any other faith that has been given a name. These are universals — open to comprehension and possession by all men, by every man. They invite your response and they can provide a never-failing source of strength and courage and vision for your life.

This is a religion which cannot ask first whether a man believes in God. It does not rest upon your view of what Jesus of Nazareth may have or may not have been — whether Christ the son of the living God, or Jesus the son of a carpenter in Nazareth. No, the final and the deepest base of religious faith does not rest on these matters. They are interests and concerns that may enter later, but let no one fall prey to the mistake that they come first.

First there must be the awareness of the great community of life. It begins to be known in the place where we now are, or in any place where we may be in any given moment. It is known in the human earthly valleys and mountains of life as the warm tides of human companionship flow about us and flow through

us. It is here that we discover the impulses that are shared, the aspirations and the hopes that are common. It is here that we know in all its indescribable wonder the affection which reaches out to meet affection; the sense to which in its highest form we give the name of love.

If we come to this realization with fairness and a willingness to comprehend its meaning, we discover there is really no necessity to have some prior acceptance of a friendly universe or the supporting arms of a deity. We can recognize the truth that is involved in the things we know and share without knowing first what absolute Truth may be. We can appreciate the beauty that lies about us without first knowing what absolute Beauty may be. We can distinguish goodness from evil, right from wrong, without first knowing what these things are in their final and absolute sense.

Religion begins to move us because of our response to what lies outside our frame of knowing, and because of what we suspect may lie beyond. It is by acting then on the little that we know that further depths of understanding are unfolded. We move, then, in this faith toward the greater understanding, the deeper comprehension, the fuller faith. We do this not bewailing the fact

that things are not yet perfect; not by crying in despair at man's inhumanity to man; but living and acting upon the certain conviction that it is our wish to make them better than they are. It is then a concern and a yearning for growth that rises in the religious faith.

This is a concept of religion that makes it the most practical and significant enterprise that can engage the mind and thought of man in our present century. Adlai Stevenson, giving the first of what is to be a series of Annual Lectures honoring the late Dr. A. Powell Davies, said that the quality of moral response is the decisive issue in politics today. And he went on to observe that most of the major problems present themselves to us in moral terms. Now the moral response of persons, singularly or together, develops from the convictions and depths of religious faith which that person or the group holds dear.

When we consider the major problems facing humanity in this mid-twentieth century, we know beyond any doubt at all that they are planetary problems and that the moral issues involved will not be resolved by any parochial faith, not by any exclusive body of doctrines; not by that lesser faith which today dominates the American scene in its religious institu-

tions. These faiths, born and conceived in an earlier age, do not speak to the modern world with any commanding voice. They do not have the breadth that is included in either "reverence for life" or "the consciousness of sanctity in existence." Yet it is out of these latter certainties that rise the moral sense and wisdom to speak to the global, planetary issues—issues which cause us to

spend so vast a portion of our substance, flesh and blood, as well as natural resources and energy, in fear and doubt and anger.

To each person who grasps the meaning of this deeper faith there come new awakenings and reinvigorated concepts of the moral base to life. It will not be shaken by the passing winds, yet it rises high enough to see the reality of things.

Editorial Comments

(Continued from page 4)

Irving Kupcinet, the author of Kup's Column which appears in the *Chicago Sun-Times*, has come up with one of the most fascinating and creative television shows we have seen. It is dedicated to that almost lost art of conversation. Every Saturday at midnight he has seated around a large, low table a gathering of very interesting people, munching sandwiches and drinking coffee. Some are well-known and some are not, but all of them have ideas and are articulate. As the name of the show, "At Random," implies, the conversation follows no prescribed course. One subject after another is discussed as the ideas move in a conversational stream of consciousness. In the few weeks the show has been on the air, we have heard many subjects discussed from censorship to the level of the water table. We have heard

the opinions, ideas, and convictions of such people as Wayne Morse, Jacob Javits, James Roosevelt, Sammy Davis, Jr., Josh White, Julie Harris, Ruth Roman, Mickey Rooney, Bergan Evans, Saul Bellow, Harry Golden, George Jessel, and many others. There is no obvious time limit. The conversations usually take from two hours and fifteen minutes to two hours and forty-five minutes. It keeps us up late. Although some conversations have been more interesting than others, none has been dull. We congratulate WBBM-TV (CBS) Channel 2, Chicago, on presenting such an intelligent, fascinating, and stimulating program, no matter at what hour it is scheduled. This is an example of what can be done. Even though it is at an hour which does not reach a mass audience, we are continually surprised at the number of people we meet who have listened to it.

BOOKMAN'S NOTEBOOK

CHARLES W. PHILLIPS

PATHS IN UTOPIA

A visit with Martin Buber in January was quite stimulating to us. This is not the place to report it, but his book, *Paths in Utopia*, in paperback from Beacon, and which we have read since returning, is a good book and title to give some unity to most of the rest of the books read for this review.

Paths in Utopia is very much worth reading. It is a review of most of the nineteenth century Socialists — Fourier, Saint-Simon, Robert Owen, and others. It pits them particularly against Marx, and ends with an evaluation of the development of communal organization in Palestine. Socialism is a dirty word in this country. That is hardly the reason it has fallen to the low estate it has as a political force, however. It was just as dirty in 1920 when Eugene Debs headed the socialist party ticket and got a large number of votes even though he was in the Atlanta penitentiary. It is more likely that the "affluence" of our society has depressed it. It probably has to do also with the fact that it is associated in our minds with some kind of "leftism." There never was much of a "left" in this country, and at the moment it is almost non-existent. Since Socialist thought has always been anti-radical, and particularly anti-Communist, it has lost a cer-

tain punch in this country by virtue of a defensiveness on this, and to its appearing to be "me too" in terms of more goods for everybody, which the system seemed to be moving toward without it. Socialist thought is by no manner of means irrelevant, however, if for no other reason than that it is Utopian, and when we get out of our present oscillation between existentialist despond and tranquillizing middle-of-the-roadism of the Eisenhower epoch in which "the bland lead the bland" — we shall have to come to terms with it once again. It will have to take some steps beyond where its originators left it, but for creative thinking we have to know where in fact they did leave it. Here is where Buber's book is quite helpful.

The goal to be achieved is both clear and simple. It is to achieve a social philosophy which "avoids the Utopianism of innocence, and the Utopianism of social control." (This is a wonderful phrase from Jerome Bruner in an essay on Freud, which we were simply delighted to come across, and to use now as a goal for social philosophy beyond the individual Freudian achievement.) The old-line Socialists were *not* guilty of a Utopianism of social control. This is the Marxian direction. From the word go he and they clashed on this. We were prepared to believe

this and to recall the Marxian contempt for all liberal ameliorations as "soft-mouthed slobber," but did not know the sharpness of some of the Socialist critique of government. Jefferson's statement that "that government governs best which governs least" is a somewhat mild epitome of Socialist distrust. In fact the NAM and the editors of *Freeman* and *Christian Economics* could get some good phrases from Socialist fathers, to direct against big government.

Almost as strongly, but not so clearly, was their reaction against a Utopianism of innocence. Their fuzziness on clarity derives from the fact that the purity of heart or spirit that mutual aid required was something to be achieved—was something more than a repristation of a state of nature. (In a Kropotkin notably there were roots in the state of nature. Witness his title: *Mutual Aid—A Factor in Evolution*. This qualified and compensated Darwinian interpretations. At a minimum, education was required and an autonomy of social organization against "nature" *qua* nature, recognized.) The achievement requires something like religion. Most of the old-line Socialists were "free-thinkers" or otherwise out of gear with "religion" which they could hardly have understood except in some form of Christian orthodoxy which they rejected. So they were deflected to "education" and to the implication of more efficacy to forms of organization than they could actually believe in. No one is more clear than Buber that ideologies do not make Utopias, and that groups do not "confirm"

individuals. His whole philosophy is predicated on the point that only individuals confirm one another in a kind of dialogue in which a third force operates, a force from the ground of "being." (God is in "eclipse.") So the net main point we get out of Buber's study of the Socialist "utopians" is their essential "religiousness" even though they had no idiom for it.

It is no less a problem today for two Socialists, like Buber and Tillich. Buber, we found in Israel, is a prophet with the traditional low degree of honor in his own country. Of various reasons we can think of for this, we would give much weight to this: He is much too ecclesiastically and legally flexible for the orthodox (orthodox there tend to be fanatic), and he is much too "religious" for the secular Utopians there in that *very Utopian* country. As for Tillich, who owes much to Buber, he is the religious Socialist, on one hand carrying a keg of dynamite for Christian orthodoxy and on the other hand very much gummed up with its idiom. But make no mistake—for both to be Socialist requires a "religious" dimension. Neither has been able to get it birthed out of the realm of ontology into language of social coherence. Buber illuminates much of the difficulty in this study of the old-timers. Humanists, whose constructive comments invariably turn to some form of social amelioration, would do well to study the history, and make a fresh cut at the problem besides beating the dead horse of "supernaturalism." (Only the yahoos any more, despite whatever words

they use, believe that there is any more than one essential Universe—though it need not be any philosophic monism.) For we surely have all got to find out how to “be” ourselves and stay ourselves in the growing thickness of society—how to keep mutual interdependence and individuality from being contradictions in terms.

Buber plays with necessities required to make socialistic organization work and, coming finally to the communal developments and experiments in Israel, pronounces them not failures, but as yet only a “limited success.” He is a troubled hopeful—a point of view hard to escape and, as to its “hopeful” aspect, sometimes hard to achieve.

Beacon has another good book out. We shall only mention *The Doctrine of Saint-Simon*, translated and notes by George G. Iggers (Hardback at \$4.95). It is in fact the first English translation of a primary source book of Socialism. No wonder, maybe, that the word has come to us with an aspect of fuzzy-headedness as to what it is all about. As a continuing partisan of getting the history of something halfway straight before operating with it, we recommend these two books, and the high relevance of the area of study to “religion,” humanistically conceived or not.

We would mention and recommend two books by John Kenneth Galbraith, economics professor at Harvard. *The Affluent Society* is the most recent and in hardback. It will set you back \$5.00. It is excellent in saying (and proving as far as we are concerned) that we are operating in a new ball

game with an old set of rules. Our official economic philosophy was formed in and designed to rationalize an economy of scarcity. We have moved into an age of abundance (in this country anyway, and potentially beyond it). We badly need new theory. This is seriously, clearly, but wittily, told. For an interim run we would say that Galbraith “accepts” a “creeping inflation.” We would not say he is “resigned” to it. He is extremely wary of it. He also thinks we need more of the “built-in stabilizers” generally taken for granted as protecting us now against anything like the Great Depression again. As to the merit of his specific suggestions on unemployment compensation re-vamping, different tax structure, and some kind of mandatory appropriation policy that will feed tax money into “public production” (schools, hospitals, urban renewal, *et al.*), we are not competent to judge. That is, we do not know whether or not they would be economically balancing and stabilizing. Of course, we personally want most of the things he wants. That in fact is what his book tantalizingly boils down to, and its hitch from the standpoint of the effectiveness of any purely legal or policy tinkering—*what do we really want?* It is the old Socialist dilemma—the form without the spirit is dead. And how do you get a spirit beyond “gimme”?

The relevance of it is that we cannot go backward. So even more useful than the above is his *Economics and the Art of Controversy*, now in Vintage paperback for \$.95. Probably few, if any,

readers of this journal need to be convinced that the old, one-time "liberal" economic theory of capitalism is about as desirable as a privy on the back lot, and is, in fact, as little used today practically in the business world. Two other things, however, we latter-day "liberals" are stumped on: (1) We do not understand why the doctrine persists when nobody uses it, nor why we argue with it so vehemently, if we do in fact think it is dead. (2) Why do we not muster some alternative? That last time any of us really fought at Armageddon was with F.D.R. which leaves us waiting for the next volume by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., to recapture the glow of the "golden age." In 1952 we thought Adlai was capable of enough creative power to carry it on, but the "old order" had a last gasp of dead man's power in it. Since then Adlai's weakness has been revealed as our own—*what do we really want?* So, if Galbraith pricks the "conventional wisdom" of the conservatives, he punches our balloon but good in saying flatly that liberals of our kind have not had a new idea either in fifteen years. The trouble is, says Galbraith, that much of our warring is "with blank cartridges, for ground that has already been won, in a war that is over." If this point could be got over—and there is more pungent, wise, clear and palatable stuff here in him (for both left and right) for sermons in the area, than from anywhere else at the moment—then in the discussions leading up to and through 1960, maybe we could have the basis for fruitful new ideas to

emerge and at least have more of a choice than between being a Neanderthal, or a Social Actionist without a cause.

Two other Beacon books are peripherally bearing upon the Utopian idea. One is a biography of *Susan B. Anthony*, by Emma Lutz, at \$5.75. Miss Lutz is an admirer of Miss Anthony, but has not let it get in the way of an honest job. The level however is one of good reporting. It is no study in depth. The "psychology" of these suffragettes (and some of our women ministers on the frontier) is crying to be done. Their spiritualized Emersonianism (without his realism); their universal delight in Robert Browning; their ambivalent femininity; their Matthew Arnold type religion as "morality tinged with emotion" should be tied to a social study of depth and breadth. With few exceptions in overlapping individuals, few eras can be so precisely defined as this one from 1850 to 1900. Be that as it may, we are prepared to say that Miss Anthony was on the right side of the fence, she was indefatigable, she had courage, and she was honest. These are by no manner of means small virtues, and in addition she probably did not smoke, drink, or swear. But we are also bound to say that she does not attract or inspire us in retrospect nor would she have (we hope) had we been contemporary, if this biography gives, as the Beacon blurb puts it, an account of the "deepest thought and feeling of Susan B. Anthony." She was politically myopic in the extreme. She played a tune with less than one string—she reduced it to one note. It was tinged with

lack of charity. The day following Lincoln's assassination she could write that it was "an act of God" and that "seldom" had God ever intervened so happily. Having no personal desire to commit women to Kirche, Kuche, and Kinder, nor to deny them any and every social role they want, we do not see how the ideal could possibly be framed in other than a bisexual or androgynous form. It is a poor exchange for both them and us to trade some grace and light for a vote, or a job. We do not believe the alternative need be pressed, but we think Miss Anthony came pretty close to doing just that. We also wonder now whether you have to be that narrow-minded and emotionally blocked to be an effective crusader. Even further, we wonder if those women inched their righteous cause a decade closer to success than it might have come anyway, if all of the social chips and forces got on the table. At any rate, though neither was a "Unitarian," either Madame de Stael or Elizabeth I is more our dish. They were neither inhibited by sex nor misunderstanding of it—and were hardly ineffective!

More intriguing is Beacon's biography of *Gandhi*, by B. R. Nanda—\$6.50. Not much of a Gandhi student before, maybe a lot of the details of his life herein were new to us, but not to others. Here is a broad-gauge individual, maturing slowly, a man from a poor background, struggling with many deficiencies. He works slowly toward a philosophy of social relations and never for an instant loses sight of the fact that a philosophy not related to living is sterile. His career in South Africa is almost

as long and almost as important as his career in India. Likely his name will never die on either continent. To have faced squarely the basic problems of both tragic places, and to struggle for maturity against the tremendous stresses involved as both places emerged into the modern world could be shattering to most people, and as a matter of fact was to the few who poked their heads up above the water line of the mass misery. Gandhi made the grade. He was neither saint nor superman. His biographer does a fine job in getting through this without debunking meanness. Whether his techniques are completely for this world yet remains to be seen. Whether they will do completely for India remains to be seen. He does underline that without some elan of "spirit" no techniques work. He mounts to the level of a unique kind of person, a "seer" who is not so much to be imitated (from which one gets only technique-ridden pacifists with the externals of Satyagraha but without the substance) as to be inspired by, and challenged and goaded by. One never really understands these people and they never let one alone. They nag one, but are among the few we can allow to do so.

One last word—a fine, inexpensive paperback (\$.50) is *Essays in Philosophy* (Pocket Library, edited by Houston Peterson). It is peculiarly well-selected. The author eminently meets Emerson's tests for books to be included in a small library—"readable, medicinal, and invigorating." This you really ought to get—to read one essay at a time and now and then.

Western Unitarian Conference

700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 53, Illinois

ELLSWORTH M. SMITH, *Executive Secretary*

The Responsibilities of Liberal Religionists

I am still a Calvinist of sorts. Having shucked off the complicated garment (strait jacket, others have called it) of Calvinistic theology, having learned to enjoy religion and even to laugh in church (guffaw is the term some of my friends use), I still am bound by a compulsive sense of responsibility. The poet who thought up the ascription: "O Duty, stern daughter of the hand of God" was a Calvinist to the core. The other day my wife, acting as the R.N. she is, insisted that I stay home from the office and rest a bit. I had to fight all day to keep the things I "should ought" to have been doing in the office out of my mind. I never could play hooky and enjoy it. I really like responsibility.

"The Responsibilities of Liberal Religion" is the general theme of the Conference part of the Annual Meeting of the Western Unitarian Conference. Harry Burns, self-styled "cow hand" of the Denver Church, talked for a year about an essay on Freedom he had read which stated that freedom should be so exercised (with responsibility) that it is enhanced, made more secure and its scope enlarged for those who follow. Harry likes responsibility, too. In the practice of responsibility, Harry has the freest spirit I know. It's a cinch that our discussions of Responsibility are not going to be lugubri-

ous. Rather, challenging, aspirational!

When you go to Denver, Thursday, April 16th, for the beginning of the Western Conference Annual Meeting you'll find yourself in the heart of a wonderful state celebrating a centennial. The usual Western Hospitality will be embellished with the grace notes of lighthearted pride. And you'll be caught up in the high excitement of a church that gained one hundred thirty new members during the first year of the pastorate of its present minister, Richard Henry.

Mailings are out, in abundance, about the program and arrangements for the Annual Meeting. But, just in case—Dr. Alan Barth will give the major address on Friday night. He wrote *The Loyalty of Free Men*, and when the McCarthy thing was at its height he wrote *Government by Investigation*. Stout-hearted liberal, clear-minded, well-furnished with facts and experience, we look forward to his lecture with great expectancy.

When you arrive on Thursday you'll be whisked off to Denver homes for a buffet supper and get-acquainted hospitality. Then, back to the church for a keynote address by President Dana Greeley (our invitation to speak on this occasion was probably the first invitation given him after his election).

Friday morning a theme address by Charles Phillips, our Omaha minister, followed by workshops. Saturday morning another theme address by John Brigham, with continuation and conclusion of the workshops. The workshops deal with the responsibilities of liberal religion in the realm of ideas, of action, of method, of corporate growth and problem-solving. Out of the workshops will come resolutions to direct the program and meaning of the Western Conference.

Friday afternoon will be yours for sightseeing.

Saturday afternoon the annual business meeting will be held. Most of the reports will be given you in mimeographed form. The resolutions will be coordinated and presented in mimeographed form. Everything will be in good order. Three new members of the Board of Directors for four-year terms, a President, Vice-President, Treasurer, and Executive Secretary for the next three years are to be elected.

Saturday night, the banquet will have a streamlined program. Major address on Unitarian opportunities and program by Dr. Thaddeus Clark, with plenty of time for discussion. This should be a pace setter for the future.

Sunday morning, a worship service, with Dick Henry presiding and our beloved E. T. Buehrer preaching the sermon. E. T. will have finished two terms as President of the Conference and will sum it all up—a sermon of prophetic liberalism made dynamic by E. T.'s Methodist-type commitment and Texas-type confidence.

Let's Be Specific!

And, now, a specific responsibility. The fiscal year for the U.U.A. ends the last day of April. As I write, that's only six weeks off. At the present, Western Conference Unitarians have contributed between \$26,000 and \$27,000 to the U.U.A. Here are some other figures: Last year we contributed just under \$60,000 against a goal of \$85,000. This year we announced an ultimate goal of \$150,000, for the U.U.A. and Western Conference expansion of program. We have hoped, lately, to achieve \$90,000. We have six weeks in which to raise our contributions from \$27,000 to \$90,000. Will it happen? This is the overriding anxiety that haunted me the other day when I tried to take a day "off." Is this yearly nightmare of anxiety necessary?

Unitarians are not poor people, nor are they ungenerous. Other denominations have wished they had our solid economic base from which to raise their funds. Dick Kuch and the Western Conference have made a tremendous effort this year to help churches and fellowships to sense their real economic potential and to reach it, and this effort followed a year of strenuous fund-raising work done by volunteers and volunteer committees last year.

The picture is like this: Many of our churches and fellowships are doing magnificently in supporting Unitarianism. Most of the rest are not doing well at all. A few days ago I got a reminder from Boston listing three columns of names of churches and fellowships that hadn't yet sent in a